

## REMARKS

This Response is submitted in response to the final Office Action dated May 21, 2007. Claims 1-10 and 23-32 are currently pending.

### PRIOR ART CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-10 and 23-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. App. No. 2002/0098888 filed by Rowe et al. (hereinafter *Rowe*). Applicants respectfully traverse the foregoing rejections for the following reasons.

Applicants' proposed invention as recited in method claim 1 (and similarly for analogous system claim 25) is directed to generating and managing pull tab games (see specification page 57, para. [00225] *et seq.*, FIGS. 5-17). Applicants' proposed pull tab gaming invention provides a deck and deal organization that is particularly well-suited for remote, hierarchical electronic distribution of pull tabs. To this end, claim 1 recites steps of "generating a deck of pull tab tickets that specifies for each of the pull tab tickets, a game theme specifying game outcome display indicia, a number of pull tab lines played, and a ticket index that specifies a game outcome," and "generating a deal of the pull tab tickets within the deck, wherein the deal specifies a monetary denomination and a sequential order of one or more of the pull tab tickets within the deck."

The invention set forth in claims 1 and 25 further addresses the problem, explained in Applicants' specification at page 11, para. [0037] and page 65, para. [00253], of shuffling electronic pull tab tickets in a manner that complies with legal jurisdictions that prohibit sequentially random or pseudo random (i.e. cannot be computationally predicted) shuffling and which also prevents local gaming operators, such as a game caller, from predicting winning tabs. To this end, claim 1 recites a step of "responsive to a purchase transaction for a pull tab ticket within said deck:

shuffling the deck of pull tab tickets using a *linear congruential algorithm* ... comprising the formula:

$$\text{NextTicketIndex} = (\text{Multiplier} * \text{PreviousTicketIndex} + \text{Increment}) / \text{Modulus},$$

wherein NextTicketIndex represents the selected pull tab ticket index, Modulus represents a specified modulus value, Multiplier represents a constant associated with the specified modulus

value, wherein the specified modulus value is a power of two and is at least five times greater than the number of the pull tab tickets in said deck, PreviousTicketIndex represents the previously issued pull tab ticket index, and Increment represents an odd integer that is uniquely associated to said deal from among other deals within said deck and is less than the value for Modulus.” Ample support for claim 1, and similarly for system claim 25 can be found in Applicants’ specification, page 65, para. [00253] *et seq.*

*Rowe* discloses a wireless gaming environment in which hand held devices are used by gaming administrators to enable voucher replacement of cash transactions. Nothing in *Rowe* discloses or suggests any method for generating a deck of pull tab tickets that for each ticket in the deck specifies a ticket index that specifies a game outcome. Furthermore, nothing in *Rowe* expressly or inherently discloses or suggests utilizing the linear congruential algorithm in the manner specified in Applicants’ claims 1 and 25.

The final Office Action, on page 2, incorrectly asserts that *Rowe* discloses “generating a deck of pull tab tickets that specifies for each of the pull tab tickets, a game theme specifying game outcome display indicia, a number of pull tab lines played, and a ticket index that specifies a game outcome.” Applicants agree with the assertion on page 2 of the final Office Action that para. 0020 of *Rowe* discloses different games such as back jack, poker, and slots having different game outcomes based on probabilities. However, Applicants note that nothing in para. 0020 or elsewhere does *Rowe* disclose generating a deck of pull tab tickets where each of the tickets specifies a game outcome display indicia, a number of pull table lines played, and a ticket index specifying a game outcome.

Page 2 of the final Office Action incorrectly asserts that *Rowe* discloses “generating a deal of the pull tab tickets within the deck, wherein the deal specifies a monetary denomination and a sequential order of one or more of the pull tab tickets within the deck.” Applicants note that the characteristics of the “pull tab tickets” as each specifying a game outcome display indicia, a number of pull table lines played, and a ticket index specifying a game outcome are incorporated via antecedent basis into this element. Regardless of whether, as asserted in the Office Action, para. 0003 of *Rowe* discloses where pull tab outcomes are drawn sequentially, each later outcome being drawn after the first outcome as been resolved, nothing in para. 0003 or elsewhere in *Rowe* discloses or suggests generating a deal of the pull tab tickets within the deck,

where the pull tab tickets each specify a game outcome display indicia, a number of pull table lines played, and a ticket index specifying a game outcome, and wherein the deal specifies a monetary denomination and a sequential order of one or more of the pull tab tickets within the deck.

On pages 2-3, the final Office Action incorrectly asserts that Rowe discloses, “responsive to a purchase transaction for a pull tab ticket within said deck:

shuffling the deck of pull tab tickets using a linear congruential algorithm to select a pull tab ticket index from the pull tab ticket indices, said linear congruential algorithm comprising the formula:

$$NextTicketIndex = (Multiplier * PreviousTicketIndex + Increment) / Modulus ,$$

wherein NextTicketIndex represents the selected pull tab ticket index, Modulus represents a specified modulus value, Multiplier represents a constant associated with the specified modulus value, wherein the specified modulus value is a power of two and is at least five times greater than the number of the pull tab tickets in said deck, PreviousTicketIndex represents the previously issued pull tab ticket index, and Increment represents an odd integer that is uniquely associated to said deal from among other deals within said deck and is less than the value for Modulus.” Para. 0020 of *Rowe* generally discusses game service transaction network services having no relation to any technique for shuffling a deck of pull tab tickets using a linear congruential algorithm to select a pull tab ticket indicx. Nothing in para. 0020 or anywhere else does *Rowe* disclose anything related to this claim element.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that *Rowe* does not anticipate the invention recited in claims 1, 25 and all claims depending therefrom.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants have diligently responded to the Office Action by pointing out with particularity how the claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record. Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance of the claims now pending.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney of record at 521.343.6116 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Matthew W. Baca

*Reg. No. 42,277*

DILLON & YUDELL LLP

8911 North Capital of Texas Highway  
Suite 2110

Austin, Texas 78759

Telephone (512) 343-6116

Facsimile (512) 343-6446

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS